



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## MINOR ACTORS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE ELIZABETHAN THEATER

---

Much interesting information is available concerning the minor employees of the Elizabethan dramatic companies. I propose to deal with the subject here because not all of this information has hitherto been accessible, and because certain doubtful inferences, based upon fragmentary evidence, have long been permitted to pass current without challenge. Of first importance among the company subordinates were the "hirelings"—the inferior players or novices who did not share in the takings<sup>1</sup> but were paid out of the company funds. I shall deal with them first, and then add brief notes on other employees—the boys, who did the female rôles and made themselves useful in other ways, the prompters or "book-keepers," tiremen and tirewomen, the "gatherers," stage hands, and musicians.

In a familiar passage of his *School of Abuse* (1579),<sup>2</sup> Stephen Gosson attacks the prevailing extravagance in dress, and incidentally throws some light upon the current wages for hirelings. "Over-lashing in apparel is so common a fault," he writes, "*that the verye hyerlings of some of our plaiers, which stand at reversion of VIs. by the weeke, jet under gentlemen's noses in sutes of silke, exercising themselves to prating on the stage, and common scoffing when they come abroad.*" From another document,<sup>3</sup> dating so late as 1620, which speaks of "the tweldepenny hirelings" making "artificiall Lightning in their Heavens," it appears that the hirelings then had still to be content with their shilling a day and their hopes of promotion to shareholdership, though the income and status of the better players, and of the playwrights, had been bettered appreciably by this time.<sup>4</sup> Even considerably after the Restoration, some of

<sup>1</sup> See *Studies in Philology*, XV, 84-85.

<sup>2</sup> *Shakespeare Society* (1841), p. 29.

<sup>3</sup> John Melton, *Astrologaster*, p. 31 (quoted by Percy Simpson in *Shakespeare's England*, II, 254).

<sup>4</sup> See above, note 1.

the inferior actors received no more than 10s. a week,<sup>1</sup> and so late as 1765 three subordinate players in Garrick's company got but 12s.<sup>2</sup> Some of the earlier hirelings, indeed, had even less than their daily shilling, though some earned a little more. In 1597, for example, Henslowe hired Thomas Hearne and William Kendall "to searve . . . in the qualetie of playenge" for a year, at 5s. a week—the understanding being, however, that Hearne was to have an extra 1s. 8d. during his second year of service, whereas it was specifically stipulated that Kendall's pay was to be doubled when he played in London, the 5s. being "cuntrie" wages.<sup>3</sup>

With wages of 5, 6, or even 10s. a week, the hirelings could not have had a very easy time of it, and one wonders how they could have found the wherewithal to jet under gentlemen's noses in suits of silk—unless they borrowed them on occasion from a friendly wardrobe-keeper. Yet it must be remembered that a good carpenter, for example, and other artisans as well, did not earn any more than their shilling a day in Shakspeare's time.<sup>4</sup> Even so, however, it seems a bit hard that a twelpenny hireling should have had to furnish bond to the amount of £40 to stay out his appointed two or three years.<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately, moreover, the hirelings could not count upon prompt and regular payment of their wages. In 1592 one Richard Jones wrote to Edward Alleyn to ask for a loan of three pounds, to enable him to get some of his clothes out of pawn, so that he might rise from a hireling's estate to the dignity of a sharer in a company then forming to travel in Germany, "fo<sup>r</sup> hear," writes Jones, "I get nothinge, some tymes I have a shillinge aday, and some tymes nothinge, so that I leve in great poverty."<sup>6</sup> Again, it appears from certain theatrical litigation of the year 1616,<sup>7</sup> that the Red Bull company at that time owed William Browne, one of its

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tom Brown, "Amusements Serious and Comical," *Works* (1720), III, 39: "the cringing Fraternity, from fifty down to ten shillings a week."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Notes & Queries*, 6th ser., XI, 461.

<sup>3</sup> *Henslowe's Diary* (ed. Greg), I, 201, xlix, 182; H. Child (*Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit.*, VI, 278), puts the hirelings' wages at from 5s. to 8s.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth*, III, 411; Feuillerat, *Revels Documents, Elizabeth*, p. 79.

<sup>5</sup> *Henslowe's Diary*, I, 204, 208.

<sup>6</sup> *Henslowe Papers* (ed. Greg), p. 33.

<sup>7</sup> Reprinted in Fleay's *Stage*, pp. 284 ff.

hirelings, back wages of over sixteen pounds—he had not been paid for more than a year.

Occasionally a kind-hearted actor-sharer remembered the poor—and the hirelings in his will. Thus Augustine Phillips, one of Shakspeare's colleagues, left five pounds each to the poor of his parish and "the hyred men of the company w<sup>ch</sup>, I am of."<sup>1</sup> And the public seems to have been well aware of the fact that the hirelings' purses were not always well lined. In the old play *Histrionomastix*<sup>2</sup> the hostess reckons "the sharers' dinner, sixpence a piece; the Hirelings, pence." On the other hand, it is worth while to recall that the hirelings whose work attracted favorable notice were frequently promoted into the ranks of the sharers after an apprenticeship of only two or three years.<sup>3</sup> Further, it is certain that the five or six hirelings each company employed, were by no means an unimportant part of its organization. Henslowe, on more occasions than one, was able to control his companies by the threat of "breaking" them through the dismissal of their hirelings, of whose appointment and disposition he seems to have had personal charge. And it is well to remember that among the obscure hirelings of the King's Men and Admiral's Men at one time were such men as Shakspeare, Jonson, and Heywood.

"When I see," wrote the author of *A Second and Third Blast of Retrait from Plaies and Theatres* (1580),<sup>4</sup> "yong boies, inclining of themselves vnto wickedness, trained vp in filthie speeches, vn-natural and vnseemelie gestures, to be brought vp by these Schoole-masters in bawderie, and in idleness, I cannot chuse but with teares and grieffe of hart lament." The reference, of course, is to the training and employment of boy actors, and it is a well-known fact that the antagonists of the stage, from Gosson to Prynne, continued to lament the practice, and to object particularly because the boys were employed in female rôles.<sup>5</sup> A number of scholars have studied

<sup>1</sup> Malone-Boswell, *Shakspeare*, III, 471.

<sup>2</sup> Act VI, l. 196.

<sup>3</sup> On this point and the material immediately following, compare the writer's article in *P. M. L. A.*, XXVIII, 143-44.

<sup>4</sup> See Hazlitt, *English Drama and Stage*, p. 147.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Gosson, *Plays Confuted*; Hazlitt, p. 195; and Heywood's answer to the charge in his *Apology for Actors* (1612), *Shakesp. Soc.* (1841), p. 28.

the activities of the children's companies,<sup>1</sup> but certain details as to the employment of boys by the adult companies have remained more or less obscure.

It seems clear that really good young actors were not easy to find, and that the adult companies were willing to pay rather handsomely for their services. Apparently the demand was met in part by the managers of the children's companies, and that sometimes against the best interests of these companies—for in 1608 the manager of the Whitefriars Children was required to give a bond of forty pounds to reinforce his promise not to dispose of any of the boys in his charge without the consent of his fellow "housekeepers."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, certain of "your great players" helped to meet the situation by training young apprentices of their own. A number of Shakspeare's colleagues did this; Augustine Phillips had his "servaunte, Christopher Beeston," later the business manager of the Cockpit company; Alexander Cooke, who became a sharer in Shakspeare's company, started as John Hemings' apprentice; and Nicholas Tooley, a particularly good female impersonator, as Richard Burbage's. And it seems likely that Richard Brome was apprenticed to the stage under Ben Jonson.<sup>3</sup>

Doubtless it was no easy task to train these lads for the important parts intrusted to them. Henslowe, therefore, when the Admiral's Men needed a boy actor in 1597, "bowght my boye Jeames brystow of william agusten player the 18 of desem<sup>r</sup>." for £8.<sup>4</sup> Many years later, in the Globe and Blackfriars Share Papers of 1635, the old actor, John Shanks, stated that he "out of his owne purse" had supplied the King's Men "with boyes . . . as Thomas Pollard, John Thompson deceased (for whome hee payed 40 *li.*) your suppliant haveing payd his part of 200 *li.* for other boyes . . . and at this time maintaines three more for the sayd service."<sup>5</sup> The statement is interesting if only because of the fact that when it was made

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Wallace, *Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars*, and H. N. Hillebrand, *Child Actors of the 16th and 17th Centuries* (MS dissertation, Harvard University, 1914).

<sup>2</sup> *Shaksp. Soc. Transactions* (1887-92), p. 276. There was also much "taking-up" or kidnapping of boys for the service of chapel and stage.

<sup>3</sup> See Malone-Boswell, *Shakspeare*, III, 472, 482, 485, and the writer's paper in *Modern Lang. Notes*, XXXVI, 90; cf. p. 58, n. 3, below.

<sup>4</sup> *Hensl. Diary*, I, 203.

<sup>5</sup> Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*<sup>1</sup>, I, 316.

Thomas Pollard had achieved such success as to become one of those who sought to oust Shanks and his fellows from their control of the Globe and Blackfriars. For the rest, in view of the fact that Henslowe had to pay but £8 for his boy "Jeames," it would seem that Shanks may have exaggerated a bit, for the benefit of the Lord Chamberlain, to whom he was appealing at the time. In any case, it is interesting to note the implication of the last part of his statement. Apparently, having retired as an actor, he was then devoting part of his time to the training of boys for the stage, doubtless not without profit.

On the basis of a passage from Chapman's *May Day* (1611), "Afore heaven 'tis a sweete-fac't child, methinks he should show well in woman's attire. . . . Ile helpe thee to three crownes<sup>1</sup> a weeke for him an she can act well. . . ." Collier<sup>2</sup> argued that "the performers of female characters were paid more than ordinary actors." An entry of Henslowe's, under date of February 15, 1600, goes far to disprove Collier's inference. On that day Henslowe noted that the Admiral's Men owed him "for my boye Jemes bristos wages from the 23 of ap<sup>e</sup>ll 1600 vnto the XV of febreary 1600 next after the Ratte of iij s. a weeke,"<sup>3</sup> a total of £6 9s. At the rate of 3s. a week, "Jemes" was receiving only half the wages ordinarily paid to the hirelings—that is to say, Henslowe was charging the company that much for the boy's service. Whether his master—who was, of course, responsible for his keep—allowed him that much spending money, is another question. As for the *May Day* passage, that probably means only that Quintilliano would have been willing to pay Lionel's guardian 15s. a week in lieu of such a fee as Henslowe paid for his boy. And even though the boys did not have much spending money, those who excelled sometimes had extra rewards, for Queen Elizabeth is known to have given valuable presents to young "Cambyses" Preston and other child actors who pleased her.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I.e., 15s. The passage occurs in Act III (ed. Parrott, II, 207).

<sup>2</sup> *Annals* (ed. 1879), III, 236.

<sup>3</sup> *Hensl. Diary*, I, 134.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth*, I, 213; Wallace, *Evolution of the English Drama* p. 114; Cunningham, *Accounts of the Revels*, pp. xix-xx.

When they were not acting, the boys made themselves useful in other ways. Thus, when Oliver in the *Mayor of Queenborough* exclaims, "O, I shall swound," Simon reassures him:

If thou dost, to spite thee,  
A player's boy shall bring thee aqua-vitae!<sup>1</sup>

That the boys made the most of their opportunities upon such occasions appears from a passage in *Bartholomew Fair*:<sup>2</sup>

Have you none of your pretty, impudent boys now to bring stools, fill tobacco, fetch ale and beg money, as they have at other houses?

Percy Simpson<sup>3</sup> thinks they had still other duties. To insure that each actor came pat, he writes, "and to jog his memory if he were 'out,' was the duty of an underling—*usually a boy*—called the 'book-holder' or the 'prompter,' who watched the cues, got the properties ready, and arranged for the music, alarums, and stage thunder." That the important duties of a prompter in a repertory theater should have been intrusted to a boy, and that this boy should have been property-man, prompter, and general stage-manager all in one, is incredible, and I do not know of any evidence to support such a view. Certainly the "Stage-keeper" and "Book-holder" who exchange notes in the Induction to *Bartholomew Fair* are not exactly children! And "the blue-coated stage-keepers" mentioned in another document<sup>4</sup> were not boys, but ordinary servants.

Provision for the employment of a "booke keeper, tyreman," and "tyrewoman" is made in the 1608 agreement of the house-keepers of the Whitefriars,<sup>5</sup> and all are mentioned again in the *The Actors' Remonstrance* (1644), and, together with "the Sweepers of the house," in the Salisbury Court Papers of 1639.<sup>6</sup> What their wages may have been we may gather from a passage in the *Articles of Oppression against Mr. Hinchlowe* promulgated by the Lady

<sup>1</sup> Middleton, *Mayor of Queenborough*, v, 1. (It is possible, of course, that these "players' boys" were not actors.)

<sup>2</sup> v. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Shakespeare's England*, II, 265.

<sup>4</sup> See below, p. 60, n. 1. The blue coat was the recognized livery of the Elizabethan servingman. (Cf. *Malone Soc. Coll.*, I, 164.)

<sup>5</sup> *New Shaksp. Soc. Transactions* (1887-92), pp. 275-76.

<sup>6</sup> *Shaksp. Soc. Papers*, IV, 100.

Elizabeth's Men in 1615.<sup>1</sup> In that document the actors refer to the appointment of a man to have charge "in bying of Clothes (he beinge to have VI<sup>s</sup>. a weeke)." Doubtless the sweepers and stage-hands did not fare so well; we know, at all events, that Garrick's "dressers," "doorkeepers," and attendants in general, got but 9s. a week in 1765.<sup>2</sup> It will appear in a moment that in the Elizabethan theater the stage-keepers, tiremen, gatherers and all, besides attending to their regular work, were pressed into service as supers when occasion demanded.

Of the dishonesty of the "gatherers," who collected the entrance money at the theaters, Mr. W. J. Lawrence<sup>3</sup> has written at length, and he has noted also that women as well as men were employed for this work. A hint as to the number of these worthies employed at the Hope Theatre, and of the miserable wages they ordinarily received, is to be gathered from the complaint of the Lady Elizabeth's Men just referred to. The actors charge Henslowe with "havige 9 gatherers more then his due, itt Comes to this yeare from the Companie . . . . 10<sup>ll</sup>." The passage is puzzling, but we know from other documents that the housekeepers or owners had the privilege of appointing some of the gatherers,<sup>4</sup> though the actor-sharers appear to have paid the wages. Still, nine gatherers, plus those to which Henslowe was justly entitled, make rather a large number, and one almost suspects a misreading of the manuscript. If the passage means that a gatherer's wage was only about one pound a year—perhaps to be supplemented by tips—the housekeepers and actor-sharers were not taking the best conceivable means to discourage dishonesty. Yet there seem to have been many candidates for gatherers' places.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps they sought the spoils of office rather than its legitimate rewards. Another interpretation is

<sup>1</sup> *Hensl. Papers*, p. 89. In 1584 the Smiths Company at Coventry paid 2s. to one Robert Lawton "for keypyng of the booke" of *The Destruction of Jerusalem*, its pageant of that year (Halliwell-Phillips, *Illustrations*, p. 57).

<sup>2</sup> *Notes and Queries*, 6th. ser., XI, 461.

<sup>3</sup> *Elizabethan Playhouse*, II, 95 ff.

<sup>4</sup> In 1612 Robert Browne wrote to Edward Alleyn to ask a gatherer's place for the wife of a hiring named Rose, who was then playing with the Prince's Men (*Hensl. Papers*, pp. 63, 85). Condell bequeathed to his "old servant Elizabeth Wheaton that place or privilege which she now exerciseth in the houses of the Blackfryers . . . . and the Globe" (Malone-Boswell, *op. cit.*, III, 205).

<sup>5</sup> See the preceding note.



possible, but does not fully explain matters after all. A document discovered by Professor Wallace,<sup>1</sup> while it does not bring "the first hint of either the amount or method of pay" of the gatherers, as Wallace asserts, does raise an interesting question as to their remuneration at the Red Bull, about the year 1607. One of the papers in the Woodford-Holland suit—brought in that year by Woodford, to establish his title to a one-seventh holding in the Red Bull—states that with this share went the right to a gatherer's place, the gatherer being entitled to "the eighteenth penny and the eighteenth part of such moneys & other comodities as should bee collected or receaved for the profitts of the Galleries or other places in . . . the Red Bull." But another deposition in the same suit throws doubt upon the first. It speaks only of "the arrerages of eighteen pence a weeke due to the gatherer's place." Even if the first deposition is trustworthy, not many gatherers in any one theater could have been entitled to so large a proportion of the total receipts. And the fact that we do not hear of any such arrangement in the dozens of extant suits concerning theatrical shares, would indicate either that the Red Bull case was exceptional, or that the gatherer's commission in the other theaters was smaller and not worth contending for in the courts. Some further light on the matter would be desirable.

"Stage-plays," writes Prynne,<sup>2</sup> "are alwayes accompanied with . . . lust-provoking . . . Musicke." Much might be said, in these latter days, on the subject of his adjective, but my point here concerns only the musicians. Their part in the entertainment offered by the Elizabethan theater was, as has long been recognized, of considerable importance. In the *Diary of the Duke of Stettin-Pomerania*,<sup>3</sup> who came to London in 1602, it is recorded that on the occasion of his visit to the Blackfriars there was music "for a whole hour preceding the play." Opinions still differ as to just how much, and how regularly, music was provided in the public theaters;<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Three London Theatres," *Nebraska Univ. Studies*, IX, 11 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Histrio-Mastix*, p. 274.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Wallace, *Children of the Chapel*, pp. 105-7; W. J. Lawrence, *Musical Quarterly*, VI, 193, etc. (cf. *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, New Ser., VI, 1-67).

<sup>4</sup> Professor Graves, Mr. W. J. Lawrence, and Professor Wallace differ in their interpretations of the all-important passage on the subject in the Induction to *The Malcontent*. For a summary of their views, cf. *Musical Quarterly*, VI, 192 ff.

but it is clear that in the private houses music between the acts and at other times was a regular portion of the feast, from the days of *Gammer Gurton's Needle* (1566) down to the time of *The Actors' Remonstrance* (1644).<sup>1</sup> I wish to add a note concerning the musicians rather than the music.

C. H. Cowling, in writing his book on *Music on the Shakespearian Stage* (1913), appears to have been puzzled by the fact that in Henslowe's inventory of the properties of the Admiral's Men in 1598, a number of musical instruments are listed.<sup>2</sup> "It is not impossible," says Cowling,<sup>3</sup> "that Henslowe had them in pawn; but the simplest solution is that the musicians in regular employment at the Rose Theatre left their instruments there over night." In this case, however, the simplest solution is not the right one. If Cowling had read *Henslowe's Diary* more closely, he would have found that on several occasions in 1598 and 1599 the Admiral's Men purchased base viols "& other enstrements for the companey."<sup>4</sup> The entries in question are interesting because they prove that the company purchased and owned the musical instruments used for its plays. Mr. W. J. Lawrence has recently made the interesting and plausible suggestion that the playhouses were free to engage the services of the Waits of London and nearby towns,<sup>5</sup> but the Henslowe entries re-emphasize the point that musicians could be had even nearer home. In many cases—particularly in the public theaters—the musicians were doubtless hirelings or actor-sharers, rather than a regular "noise" or band of instrumentalists. At a time when every tavern and barber-shop had "some instrumente of musicke . . . laide in sighte,"<sup>6</sup> and every gallant could play "his part o' th' violls,"<sup>7</sup> the actors, naturally enough, were frequently able to find all the instrumentalists they needed among their own number. It is

<sup>1</sup> See *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, Act II; Hazlitt, *op. cit.*, p. 262; Lawrence, *Elizabethan Playhouse*, I, 90.

<sup>2</sup> *Hensl. Papers*, pp. 116-18.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 83.

<sup>4</sup> *Hensl. Diary*, I, 100, 110.

<sup>5</sup> *Musical Quarterly*, VI, 200.

<sup>6</sup> Gosson, *School of Abuse*, *Shakesp. Soc.* (1841), p. 26.

<sup>7</sup> Letoy in *The Antipodes* (I, 5) says of his servants:

"The worst can sing or play his part o' th' Violls  
And act his part too in a comedy."

interesting to note that Edward Alleyn was known as a "musicion" before he gained his reputation as an actor.<sup>1</sup> Again, "Wilhelm Kempe, *instrumentalist*" and actor, seems to have been as popular in one capacity as in the other when he appeared at the Danish court in 1586;<sup>2</sup> and Augustine Phillips bequeathed to his late acting-apprentices, James Sands and Samuel Gilborne, "a Citterne a Bandore . . . a lute" and "a Base Viall."<sup>3</sup> Indeed, later theatrical memoirs and biographies<sup>4</sup> show clearly that throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the lesser players continued to discourse their own music.

In the later decades of the Elizabethan period, however, "the playhouse musick improved yearly,"<sup>5</sup> and it is likely that many of the theaters employed regular bands of musicians. The Blackfriars orchestra, in particular, became famous, and the playhouse musicians found much profitable employment outside the theater as well. The author of *The Actors' Remonstrance*<sup>6</sup> writes regretfully of their departed glory: "Our Musike that was held so delectable and precious that they scorned to come to a Taverne under twentie shillings salary for two houres, now wander with Instruments under their cloaks . . . saluting every roome where there is company with, Will you have any Musike, Gentlemen?" And we learn that "some of the musicke" employed in the Inns of Court Masque to Charles I in 1633—the playhouse musicians doubtless among them—"had one hundred Pounds a-piece."<sup>7</sup> So far as I know, there is no evidence to support H. B. Baker's assertion<sup>8</sup> that "the musicians . . . paid . . . an annual stipend for the privilege of playing" at the theaters; on the other hand, it is unlikely that their services ever required a very heavy outlay on the part of the managers.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Warner, *Catalogue MSS. of Dulwich College*, p. xvii.

<sup>2</sup> *New Shakespeariana*, I, 17.

<sup>3</sup> Malone-Boswell, *op. cit.*, III, 472.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Thomas Dibdin, *Reminiscences*, I, 108; Thomas Holcroft, *Memoirs*, I, 241-42.

<sup>5</sup> Wright, *Historia Histrionica* (Collier's *Dodley*, I, cxliii).

<sup>6</sup> Hazlitt, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

<sup>7</sup> Burney's *History of Music*, III, 376.

<sup>8</sup> *London Stage*, p. 22.

<sup>9</sup> The contract between D'Avenant and his actors in 1660 provided for "a consort of musiciens" to be paid not more than 30s. a day. In the Restoration theater, of course, music played a much more important part than in that of Shakspeare (cf. Malone-Boswell, *op. cit.*, III, 258).

A word remains to be said as to certain additional services rendered on occasion by all the employees the company could muster. The average Elizabethan company appears not to have had more than twenty actors on its roll,<sup>1</sup> of which ten or twelve were sharers and the rest hirelings and boys. It is interesting to recall, therefore, that Shakspeare's plays average twenty-five speaking parts, and that this number rises to thirty-five in the historical plays. One is inclined, therefore, to echo the sentiment of Feliche in the Induction to the first part of *Antonio and Mellida*: "I fear it is not possible to limn so many persons in so small a tablet as the compass of our plays afford." Yet Shakspeare made less demands upon the numerical strength of his company than many other dramatists. The play of *Tamar Cam*, for example (acted by the Admiral's Men in 1596 and after), besides calling for a very large cast, required a closing "procession of 12 pairs representing a number of different races";<sup>2</sup> the *dramatis personae* of Heywood's *Silver Age* number forty-one, not counting "seruingmen, swaines, Theban ladies, the seuen Planets and the Furies"; and over a hundred characters appear in the course of the six acts of the interesting old play *Histrionastix*.<sup>3</sup> It must have been a somewhat difficult task to cast these plays, but we can readily understand how it was done. The evidence shows, among other things, that the hirelings in their time played many parts—sometimes, indeed, as many as three or four in a single performance. The wife of Blaze, an inferior actor in *The Antipodes*, complains that she did not see her husband act. "I did though, Bab," he assures her, "two [mutes] the sage man-midwife and the Basket-maker."<sup>4</sup> And it would seem that even the leading actors took on two or more parts when the play called for it.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Malone-Boswell, *op. cit.*, III, 179; Murray, *English Dramatic Companies*, I, 123-24; Wallace, *Shakspeare and His London Associates*, p. 90; *P.M.L.A.*, XXVIII, 123 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Hensl. Papers*, p. 148; *Hensl. Diary*, II, 155.

<sup>3</sup> See Simpson, *School of Shakspeare*, II, 16.

<sup>4</sup> V, iv.

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Greg and Mr. J. Dover Wilson hold strongly to the view that "doubling" by leading players was the established practice, but this view is not accepted by Mr. W. J. Lawrence (cf. *London Times Literary Review*, for August 21, 1919, January 29, and February 5 and 19, 1920). It might of course be held that the passage quoted in the text immediately below does not make an absolute case of "doubling," but it seems to me worth considering.

Thus, when Feliche inquires of the hero of *Antonio and Mellida*,<sup>1</sup> "What must you play?" Antonio replies, "Faith, I know not what; an hermaphrodite, two parts in one . . . my true person being Antonio . . . I take this feigned presence of an Amazon." But not even half a dozen such men as the ubiquitous Mr. Blaze could suffice to make up a procession of all the nations at the close of a tragedy which had already sent most of the leading actors—temporarily—to a better world. At such a time, while "the blue-coated stage-keepers,"<sup>2</sup> perhaps, were beating a dead march, or sounding a peal of ordinance somewhere in the rear, all available hands—boys, "attendaunts," and gatherers,<sup>3</sup>—all in appropriate costume, slowly marched to the back of the stage and brought the piece to an impressive close.

ALWIN THALER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

<sup>1</sup> Induction, Part I.

<sup>2</sup> "The horrid noise . . .

By the blue-coated stage-keepers."

(Prologue of Nabbes's *Hannibal and Scipio*, quoted by Collier, *op. cit.*, III, 143.)

<sup>3</sup> "Gibs his boy," "little wil Barne," "guards," "Attendaunts," and "gatherers," are mentioned in the stage-manager's directions for the processions in *Frederick and Basilea* and *Tamar Cam* (*Hensl. Papers*, pp. 136-38; cf. Collier, *Annals*, [ed. 1879,] III, 207).